DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 391 HE 014 228

AUTHOR Folkenes, George T.
TITLE The Criminal Justice Doctorate: A Study of Doctoral Programs in the United States.
INSTITUTION Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards, Chicago, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (Dept. of Justice), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 80
GRANT LEAA-79CD-AX-0001
NOTE 46p.; For related documents, see HE 014 229-235. Funded by the Office of Criminal Justice Education and Training.
AVAILABLE FROM Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards, University of Illinois, Box 4348, Chicago, IL 60680.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Criminology; *Doctoral Programs; Education Work Relationship; *Employment Experience; Employment Patterns; Enrollment Influences; Followup Studies; Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; Income; *Law Enforcement; Occupational Surveys; Teaching (Occupation); *Work Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Criminal Justice; Florida State University; Michigan State University; Sam Houston State University TX; State University of New York Albany; University of California Berkeley; University of Maryland

ABSTRACT

Graduates of six institutions were surveyed in an effort to develop a profile of doctoral graduates from institutions that have traditionally offered doctoral programs oriented specifically toward the field of criminal justice. A second research objective was to develop an understanding of the attitudes, frustrations, and utilization patterns of this population. The following six institutions participated: University of California, Berkeley; Sam Houston State University; State University of New York, Albany; Michigan State University; Florida State University; and University of Maryland. A total of 95 completed, usable questionnaires out of 175 possible responses were returned. The majority of graduates (70.5 percent) were employed in the field of education. Of the remainder, 11.6 percent were classified as criminal justice practitioners, those employed by a law enforcement, court, or correctional agency. The most frequent means by which graduates became aware of their present employment positions was through personal contacts in the field (55.3 percent). With regard to self-reported areas of expertise, research, corrections, and education were the most frequently reported areas, while security and policy-community relations were the least frequently reported. Information is presented on income of graduates and past criminal justice experience. The opportunity to use their abilities and knowledge were the highest ranked working conditions. The most frequently mentioned motivators for pursuing their doctorate in criminal justice were subject interest, teaching and research in the university, and job advancement. (SW)

ED207391

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Joint Comm on Criminology & ~~Criminal Justice Educ & Standards, Univ of~~ Ill, Chicago TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Criminal Justice Doctorate:

A Study of Doctoral Programs in the United States

George T. Felkenes
Dean
School of Applied Arts and Sciences
California State University
Long Beach, California

June 1980

Prepared for the
Joint Commission on Criminology and
Criminal Justice Education and Standards

Prepared under Grant Number 79CD-AX-0001
from the Office of Criminal Justice Education and Training,
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration,
U.S. Department of Justice

Poin's of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice or the Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards.

HE 014 220

Publications of the
Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal
Justice Education and Standards

Accreditation and Its Significance for Programs of
Higher Education in Criminology and Criminal Justice:
A Review of the Literature

by Antony E. Simpson

Two Views of Criminology and Criminal Justice:
Definitions, Trends, and the Future

by John P. Conrad and Richard A. Myren

The Literature of Higher Education in
Criminology and Criminal Justice:
An Annotated Bibliography

by Carolyn Johnson

Professionalism Among Criminal Justice Educators

by Robert M. Regoli and Andrew W. Miracle, Jr.

Academic Disciplines and Debates:
An Essay on Criminal Justice and Criminology
as Professions in Higher Education

by Frank T. Morn

Joint Commission on Criminology
and Criminal Justice Education and Standards
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Box 4348, Chicago, Illinois 60680

JOINT COMMISSION ON CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE EDUCATION AND STANDARDS

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

HARRY E. ALLEN
San Jose State University
Washington Square
San Jose, California 95192.

LARRY R. BASSI
SUNY—Brockport
Brockport, New York 14420

GEORGE T. FELKENES
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

EDITH FLYNN
Northeastern University
Boston, Massachusetts 02115

C. RAY JEFFERY
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

WILLIAM J. MATHIAS
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208

RICHTER H. MOORE JR.
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28608

FRANK SCARPITTI
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware 19711

PROJECT DIRECTOR

RICHARD H. WARD
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Chicago, Illinois 60680

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

VINCENT J. WEBB
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle
Chicago, Illinois 60680

Contents

Preface 5

The Criminal Justice Doctorate:
A Study of Doctoral Programs in the United States 7

Introduction 7

Type of Employment 8

Working Conditions 15

Work Proficiencies—Self Perceptions 21

Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction 27

Work Hinderances 27

A Caution and Some Implications 42

Summary 43

Notes 46

Preface

One of the goals of the Joint Commission on Criminology and Criminal Justice Education and Standards is to develop a better understanding of the purpose, impact, and quality of criminology and criminal justice education. The Joint Commission has encouraged and supported a wide variety of scholarly activities designed to meet this end.

The research reported in this monograph represents an initial attempt at developing systematic research on criminology and criminal justice doctoral education. The research was designed to follow-up on doctoral degree holders in criminology and criminal justice. Employment patterns, job satisfaction, views on job preparation, and sources of job frustration are among the many variables analyzed.

Research such as this is of major importance since criminology and criminal justice doctoral education and the degree holders produced represent a tremendous influence on the development of education in this field. Perhaps more than any other source, these programs and the faculty that they produce, will determine the quality of criminology and criminal justice education. The information that results from research such as this should benefit the developmental efforts of existing and proposed doctoral programs.

Vincent J. Webb
Principal Investigator

The Criminal Justice Doctorate: A Study of Doctoral Programs in the United States

Introduction

The present research was undertaken to develop a profile of doctoral graduates from institutions that have traditionally offered doctoral programs oriented specifically toward the field of criminal justice which includes the Doctor of Criminology formerly offered at the University of California, Berkeley, and secondly to secure an understanding of the attitudes, frustrations, and utilization patterns of this select group of individuals.

There has been no concerted in-depth effort to develop a comprehensive understanding of this increasingly important group of persons occupying various positions in the field of criminal justice. In view of the importance of the functions of the criminal justice doctoral graduate and the great responsibility and authority vested in these individuals, it is strange that researchers have paid relatively little attention to the attitudes, selection criteria, and values of holders of the criminal justice doctorate. The principle aim here is to construct an analysis of the activities of these persons which embraces the complexity of their functions, their beliefs, and aspirations.

With these general purposes in mind, the following six institutions were selected and included within the present study: University of California-Berkeley (UCB), Sam Houston State (SHS), State University of New York-Albany (SUNY-A), Michigan State University (MSU), Florida State University (FSU), and University of Maryland (UM). Listings of all doctoral graduates were then obtained from these universities and questionnaires were subsequently mailed to all those graduates who were identified, resulting in an initial survey of 186 possible respondents. Of this original population, however, it was discovered that eleven (11) respondents had either not completed or pursued the doctorate reducing the population to 175. A total of ninety-five (95) completed, usable questionnaires were returned (a response rate of 54.3 percent) from the graduates of the six schools.

The distribution of the responsdents across these schools shows that 45 received the Doctor of Criminology from the University of California at Berkeley (47.4%), 14 respondents were Ph.D. graduates of Florida State University (14.7%), 13 received the Ph.D. from Michigan State University (13.7%), the State University of New York at Albany accounted for 11 of the responses (11.6%), and the remaining 12 were from Sam Houston State University (12.6%).

No response was received from the single doctoral graduate of the University of Maryland.

The sample itself included respondents who had received a doctorate as early as 1963 and with the exception of 1964, it included respondents in each year thereafter, up to and including 1978. Proportionally, the respondents who graduated prior to 1970 (i.e. from 1963-1969; the period prior to the explosion in criminal justice education) made up only 25% of the sample. Of the remaining 75%, 38.6% graduated during the years of 1970-1975, (1974 witnessing the elimination of the Berkeley program) and 36.4% graduated during 1975 to 1978.

The age of the respondents ranged from a minimum of 27 to a maximum 62, with a mean age of 38.4 years. The most frequent (mode) age reported was 35. Grouping the respondents by age, 9.5% were less than 30 years old, while those from 30 to 35 made up 27.3% of the sample. The groupings for respondents from 35 to 40, 40 to 45, 45 to 50 and those 50 years old and over represented 26.4%, 14.7%, 9.5%, 12.6% respectively. The survey also included both female and male respondents. Males made up the vast majority of the respondents (86.3% with the remaining 13.7% being female).

When grouping the respondents into broad geographical locations, the majority of the sample appeared to be concentrated in three regions: The Pacific region, 30.5%; Midwest, 24.4%; and the Southern region, 23.4%. The Mountain states were represented by 3.3% of the sample, the Southwest with 3.2%, and the Northeast with 9.7%.[1] The remaining 5.5% of the respondents were located outside the United States in Europe, Canada, New Zealand, and the Middle East.

Type of Employment

The information in Table I presents the current distribution of the respondents across nine possible placement categories. As may be expected, the majority of the graduates (70.5%) were, at the time of the study, employed in the field of education.* Of those remaining, 7.4% were employed by law enforcement agencies (generally in reseach, consultant, or administrative positions), 2.1% worked with courts and 2.1% were employed in corrections, a total of 11.6% of the sample who may be classified as criminal justice practitioners. Research and criminal justice planning placements made up 14.8% of the respondents, 11.6% being involved in research and 3.2% involved in planning. Those who were currently not employed within any field of criminal justice consisted of 3.2% of the sample. There were no respondents placed in either the categories of private security or other criminal justice related areas.

Current Salary in Table II presents the salary range of those responding to the questionnaire. The modal class of income was $19,001 to $21,000 with 38.9% of the sample having reported salaries between $15,001 and $21,000. In interpreting this data, however, caution should be exercised in that it summarizes the entire sample and does not take into account that educators (70.5% of the sample) do not necessarily work twelve months out of the year.

How the respondents had gained awareness of the availability of their current position is another pertinent employment concern analyzed by the present study. Table III below presents this data for those respondents who were currently engaged in the criminal justice field. The results indicate that the most frequent means by which the respondents became aware of their present position was through personal contacts in the field. Professional publications were the second

*includes teachers and administrators

Table I
Type of Current Employment

Current Employment	Absolute Frequency	Percentage of Sample
Education	67	70.5
Police	7	7.4
Courts	2	2.1
Corrections	2	2.1
Research	11	11.6
CJ Planning	3	3.2
Other Criminal Justice	0	0.0
Private Security	0	0.0
Non-Criminal Justice (e.g. advertising, ownership of non-criminal justice business, etc.)	3	3.2
Total	95	100.0

Table II
Current Salary

Current Salary	Absolute Frequency	Percentage of Sample
Below $9000	6	6.3
9001-10,000	1	1.1
10,001-13,000	1	1.1
13,001-15,000	4	4.2
15,001-17,000	12	12.6
17,001-19,000	12	12.6
19,001-21,000	13	13.7
21,001-23,000	8	8.4
23,001-25,000	9	9.5
25,001-27,000	5	5.3
27,001-29,000	6	6.3
29,001-31,000	6	6.3
31,001-33,000	3	3.2
Over $33,000	9	9.5
Total	95	100.0

most likely notification source (10.6%). On the other hand, the means of notification least often reported were fellow associates, recruiting flyers, national employment listing services, and promotion. These data could be useful to both prospective employers and employees, insofar as the findings indicate those recruitment methods most often employed successfully.

In view of the small number of respondents within some of the placement categories, the categories (with the exception of education) were collapsed into four categories which offer a more fundamental or basic view of their placement. These collapsed categories consist of: 1) educators (this grouping remained unaltered); 2) practitioners (constructed from the prior groups of police, courts, and corrections classifications); 3) research and planning (which, as the label indicates, includes the separate categories of research and CJ planning);* and 4) non-CJ (unaltered).

Using these collapsed categories as dependent measures and the particular school from which the respondents graduated as the independent variable, it is possible to ascertain what, if any, influence the place of graduation has on type of employment. The data in Table IV depicts this relationship.

An analysis of Table IV reveals that across all institutions, a majority of the respondents are employed as educators. It also appears that a higher proportion of MSU graduates are practitioners than graduates of the other institutions. This finding seems to be consistent with the frequently held opinion among criminal justice educators, that the MSU program has in the past emphasized preparing students to move into positions in law enforcement. It also appears that a higher proportion of SUNY-A graduates become researchers/planners than those from other institutions. It should be further noted that among all institutions, a majority of all respondents (51% or greater) saw themselves as educators. Thus, education may be viewed as a primary advocation stressed in the identified universities. The only statistically significant differences found between those graduates choosing education and those choosing other types of employment are as follows: FSU graduates are more likely to be educators than graduates from MSU or SUNY-A. All other comparisons are not statistically significant at the .05 level using the Fisher Exact Test.

Misner (1978) indicated in his study of criminal justice educators that "it is common knowledge in the professoriate that some institutions give preference to qualified faculty members who do have actual agency experience."[2] Although neither Misner nor the present study have attempted to actually survey and quantitatively determine the frequency of this phenomena, the present study did query its respondents about their past criminal justice experience.[3] So, it is at least possible from this datum to investigate the types of prior experiences that those graduates of the doctoral programs included within the present survey have had. From the 94 respondents who provided information concerning their most recent prior employment within the field, it was found that 14 (or 14.9% of these cases) have had no prior criminal justice employment, whereas 30 respondents (85.1%) have had at least one prior job in criminal justice. Of the 92 valid responses received concerning the graduates' second prior experience, it was found that 57 (62.0%) had held two past positions in criminal justice. In regard to their third prior job experience within criminal justice, 76 valid responses were collected. Of these, only 21 respondents (27.6%) had actually held three

*The phrasing in the questionnaire made clear that the research/planning category referred to was outside of teaching/education. The research/planning category therefore, referred to agency based rather than academically based employment.

Table III
Means of Notification of Current Position

Means of Notification	Absolute Frequency	Percentage of Sample
Professional Publication	10	10.6
Recruiting Team	8	8.5
Personal Contacts	52	55.3
Associates	3	3.2
Recruiting Flyer	3	3.2
National Employment Listing Service	4	4.2
Promotion	3	3.2
Other	11	11.6
Total	94	100.0

Table IV
Employment by Doctoral Institution

Employment	Institution									
	Berkeley	(%)	Sam Houston	(%)	SUNY-A	(%)	Michigan State	(%)	Florida State	(%)
Educators	32	(71.1)	9	(75.0)	6	(54.5)	3	(51.5)	12	(85.7)
Practitioners	6	(13.3)	1	(8.3)	1	(9.1)	3	(23.1)	—	
Research/ Planning	5	(11.1)	2	(16.7)	4	(36.4)	2	(15.4)	1	(7.1)
Non CJ	2	(4.4)	—		—		—		—	
Totals	45	(100.0)	12	(100.0)	11	(100.0)	13	(100.0)	14	(100.0)

prior positions.[4] The average length of time the respondents spent in each of these prior placements was 4.4 years in the most recent, 3.7 years in the second, and 2.1 in the third. 2.0 years was the most frequently occurring retention period across all three prior placements.[5]

Another informative way in which to examine this data on prior experience, which may also shed some light on the importance of past criminal justice work for educators, is to view it in relationship to the respondents' current employment. To facilitate this, Table V was constructed so that the respondents are grouped into four columns corresponding to the four collapsed current employment categories: education, practice, research/planning, and non criminal justice.

Of those currently employed in education (66), one-third had prior experience in some aspect of education. There is a general impression among criminal justice professionals that since most of the criminal justice programs in the country are police oriented, experience in law enforcement is all but required to secure a teaching job. However, the study revealed that less than 20 percent of the respondents currently employed in education had previous police experience. In fact, a greater number had prior experience in corrections than in police work. Almost 18 percent of the respondents in education had no prior criminal justice experience at all.

Table V
Total Response Frequencies of Reported Past Criminal Justice Experiences Across Last Three Criminal Justice Placements According to Current Employment

Types of Past Employment	Current Employment			
	Education (N=66) (%)	Practice (N=11) (%)	Research/ Planning (N=14) (%)	Non CJ (N=3) (%)
Education	22 (33.3)	4 (36.4)	5 (35.7)	1 (33.3)
Police	13 (19.7)	5 (45.4)	1 ((7.1)	1 (33.3)
Courts	2 (3.0)	1 (9.1)	– —	– —
Corrections	16 (24.2)	3 (27.3)	1 (7.1)	– —
Research	15 (22.7)	– —	8 (57.1)	2 (66.7)
Planning	10 (15.2)	– —	4 (28.6)	1 (33.3)
Security	3 (4.5)	– —	– —	– —
Other CJ	3 (4.5)	– —	2 (14.2)	– —
No prior CJ Experience	12 (18.2)	1 (9.1)	1 (7.1)	– —
Total N	96	14	22	5

A final area of concern in the development of a profile of the doctoral graduates included in the present survey is that of their self-reported primary areas of expertise within criminal justice. Each respondent could list as many areas of self reported expertise as thought to be necessary. Each respondent was asked to indicate which of those areas of expertise listed in Table VI he believed were his major areas of concentration. The most frequently cited area of expertise was research (54.7% of sample) and the least reported area was security (comprising 3.2% of the sample).

Major findings shown in Table VI reveal that a majority of graduates self-reported expertise in research, with security being the least likely area of expertise. [Almost half (54.7%) of the respondents reported expertise in corrections while law enforcement ranked eighth (26.3%) and the courts tenth (11.6%).]

Table VII depicts selected areas of self-reported expertise from graduates of each identified doctoral program. Overall, there are weak relationships between reported areas of expertise and doctoral institutions. Over 76% of those from MSU reported expertise in law enforcement while other school graduates tended not to view this as an area of expertise. Over 78% of FSU and 75% of those from Sam Houston State University reported corrections as an area of expertise while those from the other three institutions tended not to carry this identity. Graduates of FSU were the only group in which a majority (57.1%) identified juvenile delinquency as an area of expertise. In regard to education as an area of expertise, the majority of those graduates from Berkeley (60.0%) and half of those from FSU reported competency in this area. All of the graduates from SUNY-A and over three out of five from FSU (64.3%) viewed research as an area

Table VI
Rank Order of Self-Reported Areas of Expertise

Reported Area of Expertise	Absolute Frequency	Percentage of Sample
1. Research	52	54.7
2. Corrections	45	47.4
3. Education	43	45.3
4. Administration	37	38.0
5. Crime Causation	33	34.7
6. Planning	29	30.5
7. Juvenile Delinquency	27	28.4
8. Law Enforcement	25	26.3
9. Comparative CJ	13	13.7
10. Courts	11	11.6
11. Criminalistics	10	10.5
12. Police Community Relations	7	7.4
13. Security	3	3.2

Table VII
Selected Areas of Reported Expertise
by Doctoral Institution

Area of Expertise		Doctoral Institution										
		Berkeley (N=45)		Sam Houston (N=12)		SUNY-A (N=11)		MSU (N=13)		Florida State (N=14)		
		f	(%)	f	(%)	f	(%)	f	(%)	f	(%)	
Law Enforcement	Yes	7	(15.6)	4	(33.3)	1	(9.1)	10	(76.9)	3	(21.4)	
	No	38	(84.4)	8	(66.7)	10	(90.9)	3	(23.1)	11	(78.6)	UC=.18
Corrections	Yes	17	(37.8)	9	(75.0)	5	(45.5)	3	(23.1)	11	(78.6)	X^2=13.89 p=.0076
	No	28	(62.2)	3	(25.0)	6	(54.5)	10	(76.9)	3	(21.4)	UC=.11 V=.38
Juvenile Delinquency	Yes	14	(31.1)	—	—	2	(18.2)	3	(23.1)	8	(57.1)	
	No	31	(68.9)	12	(100.0)	9	(81.8)	10	(76.9)	6	(42.9)	UC=.12
Crime Causation	Yes	12	(26.7)	4	(33.3)	4	(36.4)	2	(15.4)	11	(78.6)	
	No	33	(73.3)	8	(66.7)	7	(68.6)	11	(84.6)	3	(21.4)	UC=.12
Education	Yes	27	(60.0)	4	(33.3)	2	(18.2)	3	(23.1)	7	(50.0)	X^2=10.60 p=.0315
	No	18	(40.0)	8	(66.7)	9	(81.8)	10	(76.9)	7	(50.0)	UC=.08 V=.33
Research	Yes	22	(48.9)	4	(33.3)	11	(100.0)	6	(46.2)	9	(64.3)	X^2=12.84 p=.0121
	No	23	(51.1)	8	(66.7)	—	—	7	(53.8)	5	(35.7)	UC=.13 V=.37

of expertise. The smallest percentage of graduates of the five institutions who reported research as an area of expertise was from Sam Houston, where two-thirds reported they were lacking in this area. In the areas of corrections, education, and research chi square tests indicated significance at the .05 level.

Utilizing Fisher's Exact Test, several statistically significant findings among the institutions at the .05 level were revealed. Comparing the reported law enforcement area of expertise by institution, responses by MSU graduates differed from other graduates at at least the .05 level of significance. Florida State is statistically different from Sam Houston while all other institutions' reports on law enforcement expertise are not statistically significant. In the field of expertise in juvenile delinquency, comparing by institution, it is found that Florida State is statistically different from all other institutions except Berkeley at the .05 level. Berkeley and Sam Houston are statistically different while for all other institutions there is no statistically significant differences regarding juvenile delinquency expertise. Comparing the reported area of crime causation expertise by institutions, FSU is statistically significant from all other institutions at the .05 level. All other institutions' reports on crime causation expertise are not statistically significant.

Working Conditions

A complex relationship exists between working motives, conditions, and job satisfaction.[6] It would be naive to assume that there is a direct proportional relationship between a worker's salary, job security, general agency treatment, and the level of job performance. Herzberg, for example, entitles these "hygenic factors" as opposed to true motivators because they do not directly contribute to job performance, but tend to keep workers from being dissatisfied with their jobs. Another commentator has expressed the same idea in somewhat different terms, ". . . its system rewards hold people in the system but do not necessarily encourage more than minimally acceptable performance."[7]

Supplementing system rewards, termed extrinsic motivators, are intrinsic motivators derived from the context of the work. It is through intrinsic motivation that people derive satisfaction in the expression of their own abilities and knowledge in interesting and challenging work and the sense of accomplishment from successful performance.

To determine the relative importance of intrinsic and extrinsic motivators, the criminal justice doctoral graduates were asked to rate on a five point scale eighteen intermixed intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. The results are shown in Tables VIII and IX.

In Table VIII it is readily apparent that intrinsic motivators—those derived from the work process itself—were rated to be much more important than extrinsic motivators such as salary, travel support, promotional opportunities, job security, and organizational growth. The two most important intrinsic motivators involved using personal abilities and having the opportunity to learn and develop skills. This may indicate that the respondents as a group consider themselves to be preparing for upward mobility that is likely to occur in their future careers. Having the opportunity to work in a variety of challenging and difficult problems was rated slightly less important than the opportunity to learn new skills and work with stimulating people.

Table VIII
Ranking by Mean Importance of Working Conditions

	Utmost Import.	Considerable Import.	Some Import.	Little Import.	No Import.	$\bar{X}$
1. Opportunity to use my abilities and knowledge (I)	67.0	31.9	1.1	—	—	1.340
2. Opportunity to learn and develop new abilities and knowledge (I)	54.7	35.8	8.4	—	1.1	1.568
3. Opportunity to work with stimulating people (I)	46.8	41.5	10.6	1.1	—	1.660
4. Opportunity to work on a variety of challenging and difficult problems (I)	48.4	35.8	14.7	1.1	—	1.684
5. Living conditions in community (E)	31.9	48.9	17.0	2.0	—	1.893
6. Freedom to follow up on my work and be accepted by my colleagues (I)	33.0	43.6	21.3	1.1	1.1	1.936
7. Personal recognition from superiors and colleagues (I)	18.0	53.2	19.1	7.4	1.1	2.170
8. Communication of information about ongoing research on plans in C.J. (E)	22.3	40.4	30.9	5.3	1.1	2.223

9. Opportunity to publish and become known professionally (I)	26.6	37.2	22.3	10.6	3.2	2.266
10. Recognition from students and colleagues on quality of teaching ability(I)	22.8	43.5	22.8	4.3	6.5	2.283
11. Salary and prospects for future increases (E)	10.5	54.7	30.5	4.2	—	2.284
12. Job Security—relative permanence of your job (E)	13.7	40.0	37.9	8.4	—	2.411
13. Prospects for growth and expansion of organization (I)	15.4	37.4	29.7	14.3	3.3	2.527
14. Prestige of your group in the organization and importance to field of CJ (I)	15.9	33.0	34.0	13.8	3.2	2.550
15. Support for travel to professional meetings (E)	12.6	35.8	30.5	14.7	6.3	2.663
16. Freedom from pressure in the working atmosphere (I)	21.1	25.3	24.2	22.1	7.4	2.695
17. Competitive position of the organization in its field (I)	11.8	31.2	26.9	21.5	8.6	2.839
18. Chance to rise in the organization as an administrator (E)	8.5	17.0	29.8	26.6	18.1	3.287

I = Intrinsic motivator
E = Extrinsic motivator

Table IX
Ranking of Working Conditions by Employment Type

	Group Ranking Condition Highest	(Rank)	Group Ranking Condition Middle	(Rank)	Group Ranking Condition Lowest	(Rank)
1. Opportunity to use my abilities and knowledge (I)	Educators $\bar{X}=1.298$	(1st)	Practitioner $\bar{X}=1.300$	(1st)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=1.538$	(3rd)
2. Opportunity to learn and develop new abilities and knowledge (I)	Practitioner $\bar{X}=1.300$	(2nd)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=1.461$	(2nd)	Educators $\bar{X}=1.641$	(2nd)
3. Opportunity to work with stimulating people (I)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=1.357$	(1st)	Educators $\bar{X}=1.701$	(3rd)	Practitioner $\bar{X}=1.727$	(6th)
4. Opportunity to work on a variety of challenging and difficult problems (I)	Practitioner $\bar{X}=1.500$	(3rd)	Educators $\bar{X}=1.731$	(4th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=1.769$	(4th)
5. Living conditions in community (E)	Practitioner $\bar{X}=1.700$	(5th)	Educators $\bar{X}=1.895$	(5th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.083$	(8th)
6. Freedom to follow up on my work and be accepted by my colleagues (I)	Practitioner $\bar{X}=1.600$	(4th)	Educators $\bar{X}=2.000$	(6th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.000$	(6th)

18

7. Personal recognition from superiors and colleagues (I)	Practitioner $\bar{X}=1.800$	(7th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.083$	(9th)	Educators $\bar{X}=2.268$	(12th)
8. Communication of information about ongoing research and plans in C.J. (E)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.077$	(7th)	Educators $\bar{X}=2.164$	(9th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}=2.400$	(11th)
9. Opportunity to publish and become known professionally (I)	Educators $\bar{X}=2.134$	(8th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.500$	(12th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}=2.818$	(15th)
*10. Recognition from students and colleagues on quality of teaching ability (I)	Educators $\bar{X}=2.030$ $t=2.429$ $p<.05$ $t=4.093$ $p<.001$	(7th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}=2.800$	(14th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=3.250$	(18th)
11. Salary and prospects for future increases (E)	Educators $\bar{X}=2.194$	(10th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.307$	(11th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}=2.700$	(13th)
*12. Job security—relative permanence of your job (E)	Practitioner $\bar{X}=2.200$	(9th)	Educators $\bar{X}=2.358$ $t=2.024$ $p<.05$	(13th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.846$	(16th)
13. Prospects for growth and expansion of organization (I)	Practitioner $\bar{X}=2.000$	(8th)	Educators $\bar{X}=2.587$	(14th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.615$	(13th)

(cont. on page 20)

(cont. from page 19)

	Highest	(Rank)	Middle	(Rank)	Lowest	(Rank)
14. Prestige of your group in the organization and importance to field of C.J. (I)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.250	(10th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.000	(12th)	Educators $\bar{X}$=2.627	(15th)
15. Support for travel to professional meetings (E)	Educators $\bar{X}$=2.627	(16th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.643	(14th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.909	(16th)
*16. Freedom from pressure in the working atmosphere (I)	Educators $\bar{X}$=2.224 t=2.315 p<.05 t=2.615 p<.05	(11th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=3.077	(17th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=3.300	(18th)
17. Competitive position of the organization in its field (I)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.667	(15th)	Educators $\bar{X}$=2.848	(17th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=3.000	(17th)
*18. Chance to rise in the organization as an administrator (E)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.000 t=5.720 p<.001	(5th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.300 t=4.343 p<.001	(10th)	Educators $\bar{X}$=3.716	(18th)

*The two-tailed t-test for statistical significance was used.

Table IX presents a ranking of the eighteen working conditions by employment type: educators, practitioners, planner/researchers. As a group, educators rank recognition from students and colleagues on the quality of teaching ability (Item 10) significantly more important than either practitioners or planners/researchers. Also, educators rank job security (Item 12) significantly more important than planners/researchers. In Item 16, educators believe freedom from pressure is an important intrinsic motivator by ranking it significantly more important than planners/researchers and practitioners. This result is consistent with the commonly stated thought that educators need the time and freedom to pursue an idea. A work product is not as important to them as that of the researcher/planner who often works under pressure to produce some tangible evidence of the time and effort devoted to a project.

Work Proficiencies—Self Perceptions

A series of nineteen items were presented to each respondent to further evaluate their work related interests, aptitudes and abilities. Each respondent was asked to rate himself on a series of factors, collectively referred to as skills and proficiencies. Each person was requested to evaluate his personal ability in each of the factors, giving himself a "1" for those items in which he rated himself "Excellent" down to a "7" for those factors in which he thought he was "Poor". Table X displays the self-reported ratings.

The overwhelming majority of all respondents rated themselves as "Excellent" or "Very Good" with very few perceiving themselves as only "Fair" or "Poor." However, it must be remembered that this evaluation was not an attempt to rate proficiencies, but was instead an attempt to rate the self-perception of personal proficiencies. Two of the activities rated highest by all of the doctoral graduates were the ability to work under pressure (Item 3, $\bar{X} = 1.925$) and the capacity to plan and organize individual work (Item 1, $\bar{X} = 1.842$). As one individual responded:

> An educator who has research responsibilities is always working under deadlines. I seldom miss one.

A researcher/planner comment reflected the thoughts of several by expressing pride in his ability to operate under severe pressure:

> As the chief administrator of a research corporation, I thrive on competition. Pressures help me with beating my competition.

Among the lowest rated factors was an interest in organizational image (Item 19, $\bar{X} = 3.406$), public service, (Item 17, $\bar{X}=2.947$), and interest in basic or long-term research (Item 15, $\bar{X} = 2.660$). The latter two items are somewhat surprising because of the expectation that faculty will be involved in significant public service by many criminal justice programs. In regard to long term basic reseach, individual self-perception may reflect that faculty interests lay in action oriented, practically based research endeavors. This reflection is consistent with the frequently stated perception that the criminal justice faculty member is oriented to evaluative and operational research by virtue of educational training. Theoretical research, while not in conflict with this orientation, is of somewhat less importance to the doctoral graduates.

When viewing the responses in Table XI to the nineteen self-reported work proficiencies by employment type—educators, practitioners, planners/researchers—several statistically significant findings are evident.

Table X
Ranking by Mean Self Reported Work Proficiencies

	Excellent	Very Good	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Fair	Poor	Don't Know	$\bar{X}$
1. Capacity to plan and organize own work	40.0	44.2	8.4	6.3	1.1	—	—	—	1.842
2. Knowledge of my field	33.7	49.5	12.6	3.2	1.1	—	—	—	1.884
3. Ability to work under pressure	41.1	34.7	13.7	8.4	1.1	—	—	1.1	1.925
4. Interpersonal relationships with peers or colleagues	34.7	36.8	14.7	10.5	2.1	1.1	—	—	2.116
5. Interest in teaching	36.2	30.9	22.3	4.3	3.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	2.140
6. Interpersonal relationships with subordinates	29.0	39.8	18.3	10.8	—	—	1.1	1.1	2.163
7. Interest in development (process of product) work	27.4	31.6	18.9	10.5	1.1	—	—	6.3	2.176
8. Capacity to maintain harmonious working conditions with colleagues and staff	28.4	42.1	14.7	13.7	—	—	1.1	—	2.189
9. Ability to give directions	20.2	45.7	23.4	7.4	2.1	—	—	1.1	2.248

22

10. Capacity to do careful detailed work	25.3	38.9	18.9	11.6	4.2	—	—	1.1	2.298
11. Ability to follow directions	24.5	38.3	20.2	13.8	1.1	1.1	—	1.1	2.312
12. Capacity to maintain regular working schedule	31.6	36.8	11.6	10.5	5.3	—	3.2	1.1	2.329
13. Interpersonal relationships with superiors	24.7	43.0	12.9	11.8	3.2	1.1	3.2	—	2.419
14. Capacity to plan and organize work of others	20.0	34.7	31.6	8.4	3.2	1.1	—	1.1	2.425
15. Interest in basic or long term research	26.6	26.6	20.2	12.8	9.6	3.2	1.1	—	2.660
16. Improving practical aspects within the field of CJ (excluding academe)	19.4	34.4	15.1	11.8	9.7	3.2	4.3	2.2	2.846
17. Interest in public service	21.3	24.5	22.3	12.8	12.8	2.1	4.3	—	2.947
18. Business sense	12.6	21.1	26.3	18.9	7.4	4.2	8.4	1.1	3.340
19. Interest in organization image	8.6	21.5	22.6	29.0	5.4	4.3	6.5	2.2	3.406

23

Table XI
Ranking of Work Proficiencies by Employment Type

	Group Ranking Proficiency Highest	(Rank)	Group Ranking Proficiency Middle	(Rank)	Group Ranking Proficiency Lowest	(Rank)
1. Capacity to plan and organize own work	Practitioner $\bar{X}=1.727$	(6th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=1.857$	(1st)	Educator $\bar{X}=1.865$	(3rd)
2. Knowledge of my field	Practitioner $\bar{X}=1.494$	(2nd)	Educator $\bar{X}=1.925$	(4th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=1.928$	(2nd)
3. Ability to work under pressure	Practitioner $\bar{X}=1.636$	(3rd)	Educator $\bar{X}=1.954$	(5th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.000$	(3rd)
4. Interpersonal relationships with peers or colleagues	Practitioner $\bar{X}=1.909$	(9th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.071$	(5th)	Educator $\bar{X}=2.134$	(6th)
*5. Interest in teaching	Educator $\bar{X}=1.835$ $t=1.959$ $p<.05$ $t=4.687$ $p<.001$	(2nd)	Practitioner $\bar{X}=2.454$	(17th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=3.307$	(17th)

6. Interpersonal relationships with subordinates	Educator $\bar{X}=1.646$	(1st)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.214$	(8th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}=2.272$	(15th)
*7. Interest in development (process or product) work	Practitioner $\bar{X}=1.272$ $t=3.314$ $p<.01$ $t=3.056$ $p<.01$	(1st)	Educator $\bar{X}=2.190$	(8th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.250$	(9th)
8. Capacity to maintain harmonious working conditions with colleagues and staff	Educator $\bar{X}=2.179$	(7th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}=2.181$	(13th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.214$	(7th)
9. Ability to give directions	Practitioner $\bar{X}=1.909$	(10th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.285$	(12th)	Educator $\bar{X}=2.303$	(9th)
10. Capacity to do detailed work	Practitioner $\bar{X}=1.727$ $t=4.164$ $p<.001$	(4th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.285$	(10th)	Educator $\bar{X}=2.333$	(10th)
11. Ability to follow directions	Practitioner $\bar{X}=1.727$	(5th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.214$	(6th)	Educator $\bar{X}=2.363$	(11th)
12. Capacity to maintain regular working schedule	Practitioner $\bar{X}=1.909$	(12th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.071$	(4th)	Educator $\bar{X}=2.409$	(12th)

(cont. on page 26)

(cont. from page 25)

	Highest	(Rank)	Middle	(Rank)	Lowest	(Rank)
*13. Interpersonal relationships with superiors	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=1.818	(7th)	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.409	(13th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.928	(16th)
	t=2.402 p<.05					
*14. Capacity to plan and organize work of others	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=1.818	(8th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.357	(13th)	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.560	(14th)
	t=2.114 p<.05					
15. Interest in basic or long term research	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.545	(18th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.571	(15th)	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.582	(15th)
16. Improving practical aspects within the field of CJ (excluding academe)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.090	(11th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.285	(11th)	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.925	(16th)
17. Interest in public service	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.272	(14th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.500	(14th)	Educator $\bar{X}$=3.134	(17th)
18. Business Sense	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.818	(19th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=3.357	(19th)	Educator $\bar{X}$=3.454	(18th)
*19. Interest in organization image	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.306	(16th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=3.357	(18th)	Educator $\bar{X}$=3.553	(19th)
	t=2.450 p<.05					

*The two-tailed t-test for statistical significance was used.

26

Educators ranked their interest in teaching significantly higher than either practitioners or planners/researchers (Item 5) as might be expected. In Item 7, practitioners ranked their interest in developmental work significantly higher than educators or planners/researchers. The capacity of practitioners to do detailed work was ranked by them to be significantly higher than planners/researchers (Item 10). Practitioners also ranked their interpersonal relationship ability with superiors significantly higher than planners/researchers (Item 13). Addressing their capacity to plan and organize the work of others, practitioners ranked themselves significantly higher than educators at the .05 level (Item 14). In addition, practitioners at the .05 level had a statistically significant higher interest in organization image than educators (Item 19).

Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction

What factors improve performance and increase job satisfaction for the holders of the criminal justice doctorate? All of the respondents were presented with a list of eighteen job opportunities and asked to evaluate each item according to their strength of agreement with the item. Table XII displays the response of the respondents in percentage with each item ranked according to its mean ($\bar{X}$).

When analyzing factors affecting job satisfaction by employment types—educators, practitioners, planners/researchers—several statistically significant findings evolve as depicted in Table XIII.

Educators tended to feel that they should be provided with the opportunity to engage in research and ranked it significantly higher with them than it did either practitioners or planners/researchers (Item 1). Educators as a group also ranked the desire to consult more often with other criminal justice educators significantly higher than planners/researchers (Item 6). On the other hand, in Item 7 practitioners ranked the desire to have more professional training significantly higher than educators (.05 level) and planners/researchers (.01 level). As might be expected, educators ranked the necessity of having more student help significantly higher at the .05 level than practitioners (Item 10). Educators also ranked the importance of having more office space significantly higher than practitioners. (Item 14).

Work Hinderances

An organization can best achieve its goals as a general proposition when its human rewards work in a cohesive and coordinated manner, receiving an optimum amount of information with the least amount of delay and distortion.[8] Yet every organization has a certain number of deficiencies, some of which are built in and unavoidable, and others which arise and persist perhaps undiagnosed, but which nevertheless hinder maximum goal accomplishment. The purpose of Tables XIV and XV is to discover what specific factors in the work situation delay, hinder or obstruct the holder of the criminal justice doctorate in the progress of his or her work. For this reason each respondent was asked for an opinion on twenty-nine factors that hamper work performance. The mean scores and raw percentages are shown in Table XIV. Surprisingly, very few of the listed factors troubled many of the respondents. Mean scores indicate that the overall concern of respondents falls between "Some Hinderance" and "No Problem."

Table XV ranks the same twenty-nine factors hindering work by the same employment categories previously utilized.

Table XII
Factors Which May Affect Job Satisfaction Ranked by Mean

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	$\bar{X}$
1. It is not important to me that I be given the opportunity to engage in research because I am satisfied in my state.	5.6	12.2	5.6	27.8	48.9	1.755*
2. I do not need further exposure to the needs of criminal justice practitioners.	—	5.4	7.6	47.8	39.1	1.793*
3. The opportunity to participate in deciding on my work assignment is mandatory.	45.5	33.0	10.2	8.0	3.3	1.909
4. Attendance at more professional meetings outside the office would be of no help to me.	1.1	13.3	12.2	30.0	43.3	1.989*
5. My doctoral educational program gave me the skills to adequately conduct research.	22.6	52.7	7.5	17.2	—	2.194
6. I desire the opportunity to consult more often with other CJ educators.	24.4	38.9	24.4	8.9	3.3	2.278
7. I would like more opportunities for professional training inside or outside the office.	18.5	50.0	20.7	6.5	4.3	2.283
8. I need to read more professional publications in my field.	17.4	54.3	12.0	14.1	2.2	2.293

9. For my own career advancement I must take more time to conduct research and publish.	25.0	39.1	15.2	13.0	7.6	2.391
10. I need to have more assistance in the way of student help or graduate assistants to assist in my research.	14.9	39.1	23.0	14.9	8.0	2.621
11. My competence as a teacher can be directly traced to my academic preparation.	12.0	40.2	15.2	26.1	6.5	2.750
12. My ability to perform my job would be enhanced if I had additional writing skills.	9.9	26.6	17.6	23.1	20.9	3.165
13. I need additional education or training in how to stimulate students and colleagues.	4.4	25.3	20.9	41.8	7.7	3.231
14. More office space is required.	13.2	17.6	20.9	31.9	16.5	3.209
15. My program chairman does not appear to be interested in my personal welfare.	12.0	2.4	31.3	28.9	25.3	3.530
16. Transfer to an administrative job is the only way I can increase my earning power.	13.6	6.8	14.8	39.8	25.0	3.557
17. For increased academic prestige I would like to be administratively located in one of the traditional academic departments in programmatic settings.	3.6	12.0	22.9	27.7	33.7	3.759
18. I need to have the opportunity to discuss my personal problems with my department chairman.	2.4	9.6	27.7	27.7	32.5	3.783

*Categories reversed for mean calculation to account for negative question wording

Table XIII
Ranking of Factors Which May Affect Job Satisfaction by Employment Type

	Group Ranking Factor Highest	(Rank)	Group Ranking Factor Middle	(Rank)	Group Ranking Factor Lowest	(Rank)
*1. It is not important to me that I be given the opportunity to engage in research because I am satisfied in my state.	Educator $\bar{X}=1.672$ $t=2.672$ $p<.01$ $t=3.228$ $p<.01$	(1st)	Practitioner $\bar{X}=2.700$	(8th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.714$	(8th)
2. I do not need further exposure to the needs of criminal justice practitioners.	Practitioner $\bar{X}=1.400$	(1st)	Educator $\bar{X}=1.831$	(3rd)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=1.933$	(1st)
3. The opportunity to participate in deciding on my work assignment is mandatory.	Educator $\bar{X}=1.790$	(2nd)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.214$	(2nd)	Practitioner $\bar{X}=2.300$	(4th)
4. Attendance at more professional meetings would be of no help to me.	Practitioner $\bar{X}=1.700$	(3rd)	Educator $\bar{X}=1.873$	(4th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.467$	(4th)
5. My doctoral program gave me the skills to adequately conduct research.	Educator $\bar{X}=2.090$	(5th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}=2.300$	(4th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}=2.600$	(6th)

*6. I desire the opportunity to consult more often with other CJ educators.	Educator (6th) $\bar{X}$=2.140 t=4.459 p<.001		Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.600	(7th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=3.500	(15th)
*7. I would like more opportunities for professional training inside or outside the office.	Practitioner (2nd) $\bar{X}$=1.500 t=2.535 p<.05 t=3.218 p<.01		Educator $\bar{X}$=2.338	(9th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.533	(5th)
8. I need to read more professional publications in my field.	Practitioner (4th) $\bar{X}$=2.300		Educator $\bar{X}$=2.227	(7th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.643	(7th)
9. For my own career advancement I must take more time to conduct research and publish.	Educator (8th) $\bar{X}$=2.288		Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.357	(3rd)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=3.000	(10th)
*10. I need to have more assistance in the way of student help or graduate assistants to assist in my research.	Educator (10th) $\bar{X}$=2.461 t=2.333 p<.05		Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.909	(10th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=3.400	(14th)
11. My competence as a teacher can be directly traced to my academic preparation.	Educator (9th) $\bar{X}$=2.667		Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.857	(9th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=3.200	(12th)
12. My ability to perform my job would be enhanced if I had additional writing skills.	Practitioner (11th) $\bar{X}$=3.100		Educator $\bar{X}$=3.182	(14th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=3.308	(14th)

(cont. on page 32)

31

(cont. from page 31)

	Highest	(Rank)	Middle	(Rank)	Lowest	(Rank)
13. I need additional training or education in how to stimulate students and colleagues.	Educator $\bar{X}$=3.154	(13th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=3.300	(13th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=3.571	(16th)
*14. More office space is required.	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=3.000	(11th)	Educator $\bar{X}$=3.138 $t=2.069$ $p<.05$	(12th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=4.000	(18th)
15. My program chairman does not appear to be interested in my personal welfare.	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=3.111	(12th)	Educator $\bar{X}$=3.562	(15th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=3.875	(17th)
16. Transfer to an administrative job is the only way I can increase my earning power.	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.900	(9th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=3.286	(13th)	Educator $\bar{X}$=3.682	(16th)
17. For increased academic prestige I would like to be administratively located in one of the traditional academic departments in programmatic settings.	Educator $\bar{X}$=3.758	(17th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=3.778	(16th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=3.800	(18th)
18. I need to have the opportunity to discuss my personal problems with my department chairman.	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=3.625	(15th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=3.667	(17th)	Educator $\bar{X}$=3.812	(18th)

*The two-tailed t-test for statistical significance was used.

32

As might be expected educators ranked the lack of financial support from the dean as more of a hinderance than planners/researchers (Item 1). This is probably reflective of the fact that planners/researchers are not administratively encumbered by deans. However, practitioners also felt that this was a significant hinderance when compared with planners and researchers as well.

Again, as may be expected, educators ranked lack of university administration support as significantly more of a hinderance when compared with planners/researchers (Item 3). Educators were of the belief that insufficient resources were more of a hinderance to them in their job than the researchers and planners (Item 4). Statistically significant was the finding that educators found more friction among personnel in the organization than planners/researchers which hindered them in their job performance (Item 6).

A note of caution to the reader! Because of the small number of categories offered in Table 15, few statistically significant findings were anticipated since there is little opportunity for variance in responses.

While not of statistical significance, when reviewing Tables XIV and XV there do appear to be some impediments to work performance for the various respondents. Too many administrative details (Item 2) appear to bog down a large number (63.3%) of the total population. Insufficient library resources (Items 4, 10) were rated as delays or obstructions.

Perhaps a much more significant impediment is a basic communication gap with the respondent's organization. Over 35% of all respondents contend that they do not receive sufficient information from others regarding the goals and objectives of the department (Item 14). If the basic goals of a unit are not articulated, it seems reasonable to conclude that serious communication problems exist as a severe perceived problem.

Almost one-half of all respondents view office politics as obstructing their work progress (Item 5). One respondent from a self-identified research oriented doctoral program states:

> There are few promotions here because the faculty is always bad mouthing each other to the Dean who apparently believes what he hears. Office politics is the primary negative factor here.

Several similar comments were received.

Favoritism also seems to be a serious problem. When asked specifically whether favoritism exists in their offices, two out of five respondents indicated it hinders their performance (Item 8). Again, this same pattern of responses was received to the statement, "Friction or conflict among other personnel in my organization" (Item 3). These two findings are to be balanced with the fact that only about 25% of the respondents reported as a job impediment, "Difficulties with my colleagues in the organization" (Item 19). Still a smaller number reported interpersonal difficulties with either colleagues or subordinates: 19.1% and 7.8% respectively (Items 21 and 28).

In addition to interpersonal difficulties with superiors (Item 21), relationships with superiors may even be further strained. Almost one-third of the respondents feel that their supervisors are not interested in their work (Item 15). As two of the respondents noted:

> My chairman applies too much rationalization rather than rationale to problems that arise. He is surprisingly immature to work with. He harbors petty jealousies,

Table XIV
Ranking of Factors Which Delay, Hinder or Obstruct Respondents' Work

	Great Hinderance	Some Hinderance	No Problem	$\bar{X}$
1. Lack of monetary support from the Dean to support the criminal justice program	29.4	28.2	42.4	2.129
2. Too many administrative details to attend to	21.1	42.2	36.7	2.156
3. Lack of support from the university or college administration to support the criminal justice program	28.0	26.8	45.2	2.171
4. Insufficient library resources	20.0	40.0	40.0	2.200
5. Office politics	19.1	30.3	50.6	2.315
6. Friction or conflict among other personnel in my organization	19.6	29.3	51.1	2.315
7. Student advisory loads	16.3	26.7	57.0	2.407
8. Favoritism among the personnel in the organization	14.1	28.3	57.6	2.435
9. Difficulties with production (work load, research, publications etc.)	6.7	41.1	52.2	2.456
10. Insufficient library assistance	8.9	28.9	62.2	2.533
11. Poor salary	5.6	34.4	60.0	2.544
12. Lack of space	8.8	27.5	63.7	2.549
13. Do not have sufficient information on the goals of the department	9.1	26.1	64.8	2.557

34

14. Lack of opportunity to participate in planning, goal setting and directing the effort of the organization	7.8	27.8	64.4	2.567
15. My superiors are not sufficiently interested in my work	7.7	24.2	68.1	2.604
16. Inability to devote a larger portion of my time to teaching	6.9	25.3	67.8	2.609
17. Too much pressure	6.5	26.1	67.4	2.609
18. Lack of sufficient information available to me from others who work in the organization	2.2	34.1	63.7	2.615
19. Difficulties with my colleagues	7.7	17.6	74.7	2.670
20. Too much service work (speeches, community involvement etc.)	3.9	19.7	76.3	2.724
21. Interpersonal difficulties with my superiors	7.9	11.2	80.9	2.730
22. Lack of adequate preparation	1.1	17.8	81.1	2.800
23. Lack of adequate research training in my doctoral study	1.1	17.4	81.5	2.804
24. Little discretion in developing my career goals	2.2	14.3	83.5	2.813
25. Insufficient interest by me in specific criminal justice problems which have been assigned to me as a teacher or researcher	1.1	14.6	84.3	2.831
26. Lack of adequate teaching skills	0.0	14.6	85.4	2.854
27. Lack of adequate preparation in my doctoral program to perform adequately as a teacher	2.2	8.9	88.9	2.867
28. Interpersonal difficulties with subordinates	2.2	5.6	92.2	2.900
29. Insufficient interest on my part in criminal justice generally	0.0	8.7	91.3	2.913

35

Table XV
Ranking of Factors Which Delay, Hinder or Obstruct Respondents' Work by Employment Type

	Group Ranking Factor Highest	(Rank)	Group Ranking Factor Middle	(Rank)	Group Ranking Factor Lowest	(Rank)
*1. Lack of monetary support from the Dean to support the criminal justice program	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.030 t=3.085 p<.01	(1st)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.125 t=2.184 p<.05	(2nd)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.889	(23rd)
2. Too many administrative details to attend to	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.111	(1st)	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.119	(4th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.250	(1st)
*3. Lack of support from the university or college administration to support the criminal justice program	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.090 t=2.822 p<.01	(3rd)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.400	(6th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.889	(23rd)
*4. Insufficient library resources	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.089 t=2.149 p<.05	(2nd)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.250	(3rd)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.615	(4th)
5. Office politics	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.261	(6th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.300	(4th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.667	(9th)

*6. Friction or conflict among personnel in my organization	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.194 t=2.287 p<.05	(5th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.444	(7th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.714	(12th)
7. Student advisory loads	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.313	(7th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.714	(16th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.800	(18th)
8. Favoritism among the personnel in the organization	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.300	(4th)	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.343	(8th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.714	(12th)
9. Difficulties with production (work load, research, publications, etc.)	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.418	(10th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.500	(8th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.538	(2nd)
10. Insufficient library assistance	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.500	(8th)	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.537	(15th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.538	(2nd)
11. Poor salary	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.485	(12th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.667	(12th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.692	(10th)
12. Lack of space	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.507	(13th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.615	(4th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.667	(12th)
13. Do not have sufficient information on the goals of the department	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.469	(11th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.818	(19th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.889	(24th)

(cont. on page 38)

(cont. from page 37)

	Highest	(Rank)	Middle	(Rank)	Lowest	(Rank)
14. Lack of opportunity to participate in planning, goal setting and directing the effort of the organization	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.415	(9th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.642	(8th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.667	(12th)
15. My superiors are not sufficiently interested in my work	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.552	(16th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.615	(8th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.889	(24th)
16. Inability to devote a larger portion of my time to teaching	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.571	(11th)	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.597	(18th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.636	(7th)
17. Too much pressure	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.522	(14th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.786	(16th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.889	(24th)
18. Lack of sufficient information available to me from others who work in the organization	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.555	(10th)	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.611	(19th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.692	(10th)
19. Difficulties with my colleagues	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.582	(17th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.875	(21st)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.928	(28th)
20. Too much service work (speeches, community involvement, etc.)	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.685	(21st)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.778	(18th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.833	(20th)
21. Interpersonal difficulties with superiors	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.701	(22nd)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.750	(14th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.875	(21st)

22. Lack of adequate preparation	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.667	(12th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.769	(15th)	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.818	(25th)
23. Lack of adequate research training in my doctoral study	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.791	(24th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.786	(16th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.889	(24th)
24. Little discretion in developing my career goals	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.776	(23rd)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.778	(18th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=3.000	(29th)
25. Insufficient interest by me in specific criminal justice problems which have been assigned to me as a teacher or researcher	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.818	(25th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.846	(21st)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.875	(21st)
26. Lack of adequate teaching skills	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.778	(18th)	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.851	(27th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.909	(25th)
27. Lack of adequate preparation in my doctoral program to perform adequately as a teacher	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.641	(20th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.889	(24th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.917	(26th)
28. Interpersonal difficulties with subordinates	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=2.714	(16th)	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.910	(28th)	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.923	(27th)
29. Insufficient interest on my part in criminal justice generally	Planning/ Research $\bar{X}$=2.857	(22nd)	Educator $\bar{X}$=2.910	(28th)	Practitioner $\bar{X}$=3.000	(29th)

*The two-tailed t-test for statistical significance was used.

39

sycophant, and "yes men" attitudes. I avoid any meaningful relationship for my own peace of mind, although I am basically a gregarious person.

Superiors, at least mine, is (sic) too hung up on the image that he thinks . . . faculty must display.

To further explore the area of interpersonal difficulties with supervisors, the respondents were asked the open-ended question: "On what items or areas do you disagree with your supervisor regarding the management of your organization?" The most frequent responses were:

	Number
Chairman is a poor manager	7
Not trained for management position	11
Curriculum and teaching responsibility	14
Budgetary	8
Miscellaneous or no response	
1. No response	26
2. Student conflicts	4
3. Nonresponsive to faculty suggestions	5
4. Lack of academic credentials	3
5. Unprepared as scholar	3
6. Plays favorites—salary	3
7. Plays favorites—teaching loads	2

Two respondents commented:

I wish more attention was committed to manpower development and this attention was reflected in decisions regarding funds, staff and other tangible measures of support.

Basically I have no problem regarding management of the organization. The supervisory administrators are really quite good. On a few occasions I feel they act too independently of the faculty, but again, it's usually in the best interest of the school.

Having holders of the criminal justice doctorate identify what obstructs them in their work is useful in outlining the problems that they confront because it portrays the relative severity of the problems they face.

As a group, in response to a question requesting identification of the problems facing the respondent's department, they generally agreed that there were several recurring problems in their programs. Faculty quality, productivity, large student enrollments, splits between faculty and administrators, lack of administrative leadership, funding deficiencies, and bureaucratization are some of the specific complaints. As several of the respondents noted:

There is a woeful lack of funding to support our academic programs resulting in a lack of supporting service, such as library and research support.

There is a tendency by the department chair to confuse dollar value with substantial merit.

Faculty hiring and curriculum are shadily carved out because the administrators know little about criminal justice. To them criminal justice is just a placement arena.

There is too much emphasis on the training needs of local law enforcement agencies to the almost complete detriment of my academic program. The course content of most of the program's curriculum is parochial and contained too much material that

should properly be handled by the local police department. There is little attention paid to assisting students in examining major issues in the field.

The faculty in my department suffers from a curriculum that is traditionally professionally oriented. We also have extremely heavy teaching loads that make it difficult to experiment with new causes or engage in extensive research projects.

Apparently, the overwhelming majority of graduates of doctoral programs do not believe that their freedom to do what they believe is right is restricted by the position they occupy. Almost seven out of ten (68.6%) in response to a question of this impact indicated that the position they occupied was no obstruction to their freedom. The largest number of responses to the question (4 out of 86) indicated some restriction involved "university politics." One respondent noted that in a very real sense his position as an administrator did restrict his freedom:

My position as an administrator requires me to restrict my freedom as an educator because it requires a balancing of my personal beliefs about the individual needs of the faculty, the school, and the university. For example, the problem of collective bargaining and unions often mandated that I take a position which I believe is contrary to the best interest of my school colleagues but is in response to the overall position of the University administration.

The last open-end question asked the respondents why they decided to obtain a doctorate in the field of criminal justice. Responses are noted in Table XVI.

Table XVI

What factors, personal or otherwise, motivated you to obtain a doctorate in criminal justice?

Found the subject interesting	26
Encouraged to go after the Master's degree by colleagues	2
Influence of parents	2
Received fellowship assistance	5
Job advancement	10
Teaching and research in the university	23
No specific reason(s)	2
Question left unanswered by respondent	5
	75 responses

The idealistic nature of some of the respondents is evident in some of the answers given:

My principal interest was in advocating change within the criminal justice school and motivating pre-service students to become change agents.

My goal was the desire to work in the highest professional status in the field.

I guess my altruism had a great deal to do with my desire to secure the criminal justice oriented doctorate.

A Caution and Some Implications

Throughout the presentation of the results in this research, I have attempted in modest terms to present some conclusions and generalizations that may be drawn from the findings. This approach was taken for a variety of reasons including a healthy respect for the danger of making sweeping generalizations about the causal effects of non-experimental research, a limitation that may be applied to the findings of any cross-sectional study. However, I do believe the study is worthwhile because the data collection permits a logical and rational analysis of emerging trends regarding initial employment, educational utilization, educational satisfaction, and job concerns of the respondents.

There are additional factors which also limit the conclusions and generalizations to be drawn from the findings. Most obvious is the absence of about 45% of those receiving questionnaires who did not respond. Had they responded, findings may have been altered in either direction.

Secondly, the demise of the School of Criminology at the University of California-Berkeley greatly reduced the number of doctoral graduates from the six institutions. Also the large number of graduates from the School of Criminology prior to its elimination may have the following limitations. In the strictest sense, the research findings are applicable to the other graduates of those programs studied only to the degree that those not responding share the same conditions and experiences as those who did respond. In using a one-shot survey, reliability of the instrument could be suspect and self-reported perception by respondents is potentially problematic in terms of validity.

Also no sound data in actual conditions in current and past employment was included in the study, therefore, only speculation about trends or influences regarding attitudes, frustrations, and self-reported abilities was permissible.

A final limitation deals with the frame of reference of the individual respondents. Survey instruments were administered at various points under various conditions. For instance, some respondents were in their initial job only a few months, others a few years, and some several years or longer. Thus the context from which graduates approached the questions differed and consequently responses, results, and interpretations are all affected. Despite these limitations, there are still significant implications that can be drawn from the findings which can in their broadest sense be addressed to four audiences, namely, holders of the criminal justice oriented doctoral degree, potential holders, institutions currently involved or potentially involved in criminal justice doctoral education and criminal justice agencies.

In light of recent severe cuts in federal and state assistance to the criminal justice consortium, and particularly the elimination of federal support to criminal justice education through the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) in the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), it becomes incumbent upon educational insitutions to recognize the need to retain specially educated criminal justice doctoral holders. Helping to remove some of the perceived difficulties may very well lead to retention of individuals who would otherwise place themselves in the academic marketplace. At a time when criminal justice education is being criticized by private and public groups, any wasting of this specialized talent may have severe repercussions for the institution. This is especially important because of the dissatisfaction with many aspects of the criminal justice education job as now structured.

Information from this research should be utilized by those who are studying for the criminal justice oriented doctorate to assist them in understanding the

realities in teaching and conducting research in educational institutions. This research may directly aid them in identifying work problems that may exist between themselves and criminal justice agencies leaving in mind that a large number of respondents expressed the observation that they need to spend more effort in getting to know the practicing field of criminal justice (Table XI).

This kind of study should be continued but needs to be broken down into more manageable segments. Experimental designs should be considered to permit the development of predictive principles and to identify cause and effect relationships (e.g., a separate study of holders of the doctorate in areas other than criminal justice but employed in criminal justice educational programs or other identified criminal justice agencies utilizing many of the items in the survey instrument to add an element of precision not possible in the initial study).

A more detailed statistical analysis of the existing data should offer a fruitful insight and add substance and clarification to overall findings.

The data and findings in this research not only define what the criminal justice doctorate recipient holds as values, aspirations or work satisfaction, but additionally provide program administrators with an idea of the frustrations and satisfactions that they have. Potential educators, practitioners and researchers/planners will find some assessment of reality by pursuing the data. Hopefully, it can be utilized as a buoy in planning their careers.

The research uncovered evidence indicating little usage of the methods used to recruit new faculty members. Well over half of the respondents reported "personal means" as the method used to gain initial employment. Little utilization of flyers, brochures, announcements in professional journals, or national listing services was reported. The findings indicate that much of the administrative effort given to such advertising is largely wasted, even with the emphasis given to satisfying affirmative action guidelines. It is not an effective use of resources to continue an unproductive effort although it is unlikely that much can or will be done.

The findings indicate that education is the overwhelming choice of the respondents as a chosen employment field. With this in mind, fruitful research should be conducted to ascertain the particular concentration areas and course subjects that would be of benefit to those entering an academic career. The relationship between initial employment and education of the respondents lends support to the need for a critical re-examination of the current criminal justice doctoral curricula at the several institutions because of the degree of dissatisfaction with curriculum deficiencies, i.e., the need for more research oriented courses.

As a final note, it is apparent from this limited research, that not much is known about the graduates of criminal justice oriented doctoral programs. Less is known regarding those individuals possessing a doctorate and teaching in criminal justice programs. I suspect that they all have the aspirations, ambitions, goals, satisfactions, and frustrations found in the group studied. However, speculation will not suffice. Future researchers need to address this issue with increased concern.

Summary

In order to develop a profile of doctoral graduates from institutions that have traditionally offered doctoral programs oriented specifically toward the field of criminal justice, including doctorate of criminology formerly offered at the University of California-Berkeley, graduates of six institutions were surveyed. In addition to developing a profile of these graduates, the research was under-

taken to secure an understanding of the attitudes, frustrations, and utilization patterns of this select group of individuals. The following six institutions were selected and included within the present study: University of California-Berkeley (UCB), Sam Houston State University (SHS), State University of New York-Albany (SUNY-A) Michigan State University (MSU), Florida State University (FSU), and University of Maryland (UM). A total of ninety-five (95) completed, usable questionnaires out of 175 possible responses were returned (a response rate of 54.3 percent) from graduates of the six institutions.

With regard to the type of employment held by graduates, the survey results indicate the distribution of the respondents across nine possible placement categories. The majority of graduates (70.5%) were, at the time of the study, employed in the field of education. Of those remaining, 11.6% of the sample may be classified as criminal justice practitioners, those employed by a law enforcement, court, or correctional agency. Research and criminal justice planning placements made up 14.8% of the respondents. Respondents who were not employed within any field of criminal justice consisted of 3.2% of the sample. There were no respondents placed in either the categories of private security or other criminal justice related areas.

Included in the analysis of responses is a breakdown by employment category by doctoral institution. The modal class of income for the respondents was $19,001 to $21,000 with 38.9% of the sample having reported salaries between $15,001 and $21,000. Due to the high percentage of educators (70% of the sample) caution should be exercised in interpreting this data because educators do not necessarily work twelve months out of the year.

With regard to how the graduates became aware of their present employment positions, the most prevalent means of notification was through personal contacts in the field (55.3%). The least frequent means of notification were through fellow associates (3.2%), national employment listing services (4.2%), and promotion (3.2%).

The final two areas of concern in the development of a profile of the doctoral graduates included in the present survey are the degree of the graduates' past criminal justice experience, and their self-reported primary areas of expertise within criminal justice. The past criminal justice experience responses were examined and compared with respondents' current employment. These responses were also examined with regard to the number of prior employments in criminal justice each graduate had and the duration of each of those employments.

With regard to the self-reported areas of expertise, research (54.7%), corrections (47.4%), and education (45.3%) were the most frequently reported areas. Security (3.2%) and police-community relations (7.4%) were the least frequently reported.

To gain an understanding of the attitudes, frustrations, and utilization patterns of the graduates with regard to their employment, the respondents were surveyed for their perception of their employment environment. A total of eighteen intrinsic and extrinsic motivators were presented to graduates for ranking on a five point scale. The results were then ranked by mean importance of working conditions and also working conditions by employment type. The opportunity to use their abilities and knowledge and the opportunity to learn and develop new abilities and knowledge were the highest ranking working conditions in both analyses. The graduates were also asked to rank their self-perceptions of their work proficiencies on a five point scale. The nineteen proficiencies were then ranked by mean and by employment type. The capacity to plan and

organize their own work, and knowledge of their field were perceived as the most important of the work proficiencies.

Factors which may affect job satisfaction were measured. The eighteen factors were again ranked by mean and by employment type. Of particular interest was that the ranking by employment type clearly showed the difference in perception between educators, and the practitioner, planner, and researcher. The opportunity to engage in research was a major factor in job satisfaction, especially for the educators. Graduates also indicated that lack of monetary support and having too many administrative details to attend to were the major factors delaying, hindering, or obstructing their work. Again, there were differences with regard to employment type.

The graduates were also asked to indicate what factors, personal or otherwise, motivated them to obtain a doctorate in criminal justice. The top three factors cited were: 1) found the subject interesting, 2) teaching and research in the university, and 3) job advancement.

Notes

1. The regions consist of the following states: PACIFIC: Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington. MIDWEST: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. SOUTHERN: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. MOUNTAIN: Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming. SOUTHWEST: Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas. NORTHEAST: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and New York.

2. Gordon Misner, "Criminal Justice Education: A National Profile," (Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, 1978), p. 29.

3. For an interesting analysis of experimental requirements involved in recruiting criminal justice faculty members see: Lawrence W. Sherman and the National Advisory Commission on Higher Education for Police Officers, *The Quality of Police Education*. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978) pp. 121-126. According to the report, experience is all but a prerequisite in most criminal justice programs.

4. The sharp decrease in the number of valid cases was due to the fact that 16 of the respondents had mistakenly reported their current position as their most recent prior criminal justice employment and, as a result, only data pertaining to their last two positions were available for analysis.

5. It should be noted that prior experience included criminal justice experience gained by the respondent during any period of military service. These experiences were placed into the most appropriate category (e.g. military police work fell under the "police" category).

6. Fred Herzberg, "Work and Motivation," *Behavorial Sciences: Concepts and Management Application*, (Oak Park, Ill.: National Industrial Conference Board, 1969) pp. 20-25; Fred Herzberg, B. Mausner, and B. Synderman, *The Motivation to Work*. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1959).

7. Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn, *The Social Psychology of Organization*. (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966), p. 389.

8. Dale Yoder and Herman G. Neneman (Eds.) *Motivation and Commitment*. (Washington, D.C.: The Bureau of National Affairs, 1975), pp. 4-6, 8, 26-28; Richard M. Steers, *Organizational Effectiveness: A Behavioral View*. (Santa Monica, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, 1977), pp. 102-104.